

COMMENTS

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Office Action mailed on September 06, 2005. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action claims 1 and 3-29 were pending. By way of the present response the Applicants have: 1) not amended any claims; 2) not added any new claims; and 3) have not canceled any claims. As such, claims 1 and 3 – 29 remain pending. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of all claims now presented.

The Examiner has maintained a rejection of all of the Applicant's claims under 35 USC 102(e) in light of the reference U.S. Patent No. 6,496,540 (hereinafter "Widmer"), under 35 USC 102(b) in light of the reference U.S. Patent No. 6,496,540 (hereinafter "Nelson"), and 35 USC 103(a) in light of Widmer in view of Nelson.

Widmer appears to be silent as to the location of the skew measurements. In the Office Action mailed on September 6, 2005, The Examiner contends that Widmer is not restricted exclusively to the side of the measurement. However, in order to anticipate the claim, Widmer MUST teach, suggest, or disclose that the skew measurements are done at the receiving side. Regarding the point where skew is measured, in the Office Action mailed on September 6, 2005, on page 7, paragraph 3, The Examiner contends that "Those of ordinary skill in memory

testing and skew compensation will recognize that the ability to effect such timing is a circuit design choice". However, the Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to paragraph 1 and 2 on page 2 of the Applicant's specification to demonstrate why it is patently different to take measurements at the receiving side.

Skew may arise because the transfer function and/or trace length of the data signal line 103 is different than the transfer function and/or trace length of the clock signal line 104. For example if the data signal line 103 is shorter or has less capacitance than the clock signal line 103, the rising edges of the tx clock signal 108 will have more than 90 degrees of phase shift with respect to the rising edges of the tx data signal 107.

For a given difference in transfer function and/or trace length between the data and clock signal lines 103, 104, greater skew is observed between the tx data signal and clock signal [sic] as the frequency of operation of the serial link 110 increases. That is, the differences between the signal lines 103, 104 have an effect on the delay of the signals as they propagate from the transmitting unit 101 to the receiving unit 102. As the frequency of the serial link's operation rises, the delay represents a greater percentage of the data signal's pulse widths.

--- Applicant's specification lines 1 and 2 on page 2

It is clear from the reading that due to different frequencies and different lengths of the paths, the skew may be substantially different at the transmitting side as compared to the receiving side. Therefore, the fact that the point where skew is measured or the location of skew adjustment is not JUST a "circuit design choice". Pursuant to MPEP 2144.03 (C), the applicant respectfully demands that the Examiner provide a prior art reference proving his contention. Similarly, Nelson is silent as to the location of skew measurement. Therefore, both Widner and Nelson do not anticipate the feature that skew measurement is performed on the receiving side.

In the Office Action mailed on September 6, 2005, on page 4, last paragraph, The Examiner mentioned that “.... Equivalent means are provided for eliminating skews via multiple values of a period to effectively result in phase interpolation means.” The Applicant respectfully submits that in a rejection under 25 U.S.C. 102, The Examiner cannot use “equivalent art” (refer to section 2131 (supra)). The doctrine of anticipation mandates that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Furthermore, the Examiner has not provided any proof that Widmer actually discloses a “equivalent mean”. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner provide a prior art showing that the prior art disclosed by Widmer is equivalent to the subject matter of Applicant’s claim limitation and using that prior art reference the Examiner to show that the claim limitation in question is disclosed by Widmer inherently (as required by MPEP 2131.01).

The Applicant’s claims further recite skew measurement with a first semiconductor chip and skew adjustment with a second semiconductor chip. These claim elements are manifestly distinguishable from the teachings of U.S. Patent 5,457,718 (hereinafter, “Anderson”) which is incorporated by reference by Widmer (See, Col. 10, lines 2-4). Essentially the “data-retiming” circuit taught by Anderson is only suggested as being for implementation on a single semiconductor chip (e.g., “Fig. 1 illustrates a digital circuit for retiming a data input of an integrated circuit chip with respect to a local clock”, Col. 3, lines 49-50

of Widmer). Similarly, Nelson does not disclose, teach, or suggest presence of two semiconductor chips.

As described above, Widmer fails to disclose all the limitations of the independent claims 1, 8, 17, and 27. Nelson also fails to disclose all the limitations of independent claims 1, 8, 17, and 27.

Therefore, the applicant's independent claims 1, 8, 17, and 27 are patentable over the Widmer and Nelson references alone or in combination. Because each of the Applicant's independent claims are patentable, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of the Applicant's claims are patentable, and, respectfully requests the allowance of same.

Because the Applicant has demonstrated the patentability of all pending independent claims, the Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable. The Applicant's silence with respect to the dependent claims should not be construed as an admission by the Applicant that the Applicant is complicit with the Examiner's rejection of these claims. Because the Applicant has demonstrated the patentability of the independent claims, the Applicant need not substantively address the theories of rejection applied to the dependent claims.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666. If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the prosecution of

this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Robert B. O'Rourke at
(408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: January 6, 2006



Robert B. O'Rourke
Reg. No. 46,972

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300